

## 2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: Defense Advisory Committee on Military Personnel Testing

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 05:31:04 AM

### 1. Department or Agency

Department of Defense

### 2. Fiscal Year

2018

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

Defense Advisory Committee on Military Personnel Testing

### 3b. GSA Committee No.

405

### 4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

### 5. Current Charter

04/22/2018

### 6. Expected Renewal Date

04/22/2020

### 7. Expected Term Date

### 8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

### 8b. Specific Termination Authority

### 8c. Actual Term Date

### 9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

### 10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

No

### 10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

### 11. Establishment Authority

Agency Authority

### 12. Specific Establishment Authority

PDUSD(P&R) Memorandum

### 13. Effective Date

11/28/1980

### 14. Committee Type

Continuing

### 14c. Presidential?

No

### 15. Description of Committee

Scientific Technical Program Advisory Board

### 16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

### 17a. Open Meetings 2 17b. Closed Meetings 0 17c. Partially Closed Meetings 0 17d. Total Meetings and Dates 2

Purpose	Start	End
Review progress of research and development concerning the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) and related potential non cognitive enlistment screening measures.	01/18/2018	01/19/2018
Review progress of research and development concerning the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB), additional cognitive testing, non-cognitive enlistment screening measure and various administration devices.	09/20/2018	09/21/2018

### Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 2

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$100,500.00	\$100,500.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00

<b>18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff</b>	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00
<b>18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)</b>	\$2,424.00	\$4,000.00
<b>18d. Total</b>	\$118,924.00	\$120,500.00
<b>19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)</b>	0.60	0.60

#### **20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?**

During the fiscal year, the Committee continued to work with the Services, U.S. Military Entrance Processing Command, and the Office of People Analytics (OPA) to implement recommendations from the 2016 Biennial Report. The recommendations emanating from the Reports and Committee meetings cover three broad areas: (1) Item evaluation for the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) tests; (2) Development and evaluation of alternative concepts of ASVAB operations; (3) Development and validation of non-cognitive enlistment screening measures. The Committee provided continuing guidance on development of formal documentation and a set of standard operating procedures for the ASVAB test development process. The Committee reviewed OPA proposals for various concepts of operation for internet-administered computer-adaptive testing (iCAT-ASVAB). The Committee also evaluated new content and test administration concepts for enlistment testing. In terms of test content, the Committee supported exploration of non-cognitive measures in the enlistment screening process, along with other recommendations from the ASVAB Review Panel.

#### **20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?**

The Committee may be composed of up to seven psychologists who are experts in educational and psychological testing. Their expertise can be grouped into four general areas: (1) calibration/equating; (2) personnel selection and classification; (3) computer adaptive testing; (4) educational testing and counseling. In addition, the Committee's membership is balanced in terms of race/ethnicity, gender and organizational background.

#### **20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?**

The Committee will be meeting twice during FY 2018, in order to accommodate the availability of data, preparation of analyses, and budgetary constraints. The Committee will need to continue to meet to review the technical aspects of the following testing projects: (1) revisions of the materials for the Student Testing Program; (2) new ASVAB tests being developed; (3) research related to computer adaptive testing; (4) evaluation and operational testing of new concepts of enlistment testing at Military Entrance Test Sites. Two meetings will be scheduled for FY 2019.

**20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?**

The Committee was established in 1980 because DoD's enlistment test was incorrectly calibrated to previous versions of the test. Since scores were inflated as a result of this miscalibration, almost 250,000 recruits entered service who should have been denied enlistment. The Committee, composed of eminent authorities from the fields of educational and psychological testing, is the only group of civilians who review DoD's efforts to develop enlistment tests and classify recruits into occupational specialties. The enlistment test scores of qualified applicants are used to report to Congress on the quality of the All Volunteer Force, a critical index of Force readiness.

**20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?**

Meetings are not closed.

**21. Remarks**

Department of Defense (DoD) policy between fiscal year 2007 and 2011 required that subcommittee members be listed separately in the subcommittee section of GSA's Database, even if they were duly appointed members of the parent committee. This policy, in some instances, caused a duplication of entries. Beginning in fiscal year 2012, DoD will only list in the subcommittee section of GSA's Database those who are appointed to just a subcommittee. If an individual is appointed to the parent committee and to one of the committee's authorized subcommittees then his or her subcommittee affiliation will be reflected in the parent committee membership section of GSA's Database.

**Designated Federal Officer**

Sofiya M. Velgach Assistant Director for Accession Policy, Personnel and Readiness

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Plake, Barbara	02/25/2013	02/24/2021	University of Negraska-Lincoln, Professor Emeritus; Psychometrician	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Rodriguez, Michael	03/14/2013	03/13/2021	University of Minnesota, Associate Professor of Quantitative Methods, Dept of Educational Psychology	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Schmitt, Neal	02/26/2013	02/25/2021	Michigan State University, Professor Emeritus, Dept of Psychology/Industrial and Organizational Psychology	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Sweeney, Kevin	06/23/2015	06/22/2023	VP for Psychometrics, The College Board	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

**Number of Committee Members Listed: 4**

**Narrative Description**

This Committee provides state-of-the-art, objective review for the Department of Defense enlistment testing programs and R&D programs related to the Armed Services Vocational

Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) and enlistment of high quality recruits.

**What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?**

Checked if Applies

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Improvements to health or safety                  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Trust in government                               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major policy changes                              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Advance in scientific research                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Effective grant making                            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Improved service delivery                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Increased customer satisfaction                   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Other   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Outcome Comments**

NA

**What are the cost savings associated with this committee?**

Checked if Applies

- |                            |                                     |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None                       | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Unable to Determine        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Under \$100,000            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000      | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000    | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Over \$10,000,000          | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Cost Savings Other         | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**Cost Savings Comments**

Without a valid enlistment aptitude screening measure, the military would be unable to accurately select applicants who could be successfully trained to perform complex military tasks. Training failures would increase and on-the-job performance would suffer. Costs of training and job performance failures would be high - in the millions of dollars. As with the 1980 ASVAB misnorming fallout, which led to creation of the DACMPT, the cost to repair lost confidence in the readiness of the military would require additional investment.

**What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?**

### Number of Recommendations Comments

The Committee, in the course of its meetings makes a variety of recommendations. Some are immediately implemented, some require longer term accommodation, while other recommendations are modified in the course of test development. The Committee made 37 recommendations in the last Biennial Report, plus a number of recommendations captured in the meeting minutes.

**What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?**

98%

**% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments**

NA

**What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?**

2%

**% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments**

NA

**Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?**

Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

### Agency Feedback Comments

When the Committee's Biennial Report is published, we respond to each recommendation via a separate briefing to the Committee in an open meeting.

**What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?**

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other

☐

**Action Comments**

NA

**Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?**

No

**Grant Review Comments**

NA

**How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?**

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO

☒

Online Agency Web Site

☐

Online Committee Web Site

☐

Online GSA FACA Web Site

☒

Publications

☐

Other

☐

**Access Comments**

N/A